



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,296	09/09/2004	Masaaki Takamiya	RSW920040103US1 (308)	5295
46320	7590	06/12/2008	EXAMINER	
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP			ABDUL-ALI, OMAR R	
STEVEN M. GREENBERG		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE		2178		
SUITE 3020		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
BOCA RATON, FL 33487		06/12/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/711,296	TAKAMIYA, MASAAKI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	OMAR ABDUL-ALI	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-13 and 15-18 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

The following action is in response to the response filed February 1, 2008. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saidenberg et al. (US 2004/0003347) in view of the article 'Using Stylesheets' by Michael Kay (hereinafter Kay).

Claims 1, 7, and 13: Saidenberg discloses a system and method for displaying a user interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet, comprising:

- a. retrieving the style sheet having user interface properties (page 12, paragraph 96);
- b. retrieving software instructions(sequences of instructions) to be executed on a client machine (page 5, paragraph 48);
- c. retrieving a script for providing said software instructions access to the style sheet (page 12, paragraph 98);

d. executing said software instructions on the client machine, said software instructions calling the script to retrieve user interface properties, said software instructions, when executed, displaying a user interface screen in accordance with the retrieved user interface properties (page 12, paragraph 100).

Saidenberg discloses supporting Java applets including sequences of instructions provided in accordance with JavaScript (page 5, paragraph 48), but does not explicitly disclose the software instructions are disposed a Java applet. Kay discloses a similar system for displaying a user interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet that further discloses using instructions disposed in a Java applet that apply a given style sheet to an XML document (page 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to dispose the software instructions that access a style sheet in Saidenberg. One would have been motivated to dispose the instructions in a Java applet in order to save resources on the server by performing the instructions on the client machine.

Claims 2, 8, and 14: Cancelled

Claims 3, 9, and 15: Saidenberg and Kay disclose a system and method for displaying a user interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet as in Claims 1, 7, and 13 above, and Saidenberg further discloses:

a. the script is a JavaScript (page 12, paragraph 96).

Claims 4, 10, and 16: Saidenberg and Kay disclose a system and method for displaying a user interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet as in Claims 3, 9, and 15 above, and Kay further discloses the Java applet utilizes a Java-JavaScript API to call the JavaScript (page 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a Java-JavaScript API to call the JavaScript in Saidenberg. One would have been motivated to enable the applet to use a Java-JavaScript API to call the JavaScript in view of the fact the API is used to support requests for services, and Java is a widely used programming language throughout the internet and World Wide Web (WWW).

Claims 5, 11, and 17: Saidenberg and Kay disclose a system and method for displaying a user interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet as in Claims 1, 7, and 13 above, and Saidenberg further discloses:

a. a portal application server for delivering the style sheet, the script, and the software instructions (page 12, paragraph 100).

Claims 6, 12, and 18: Saidenberg discloses a system and method for displaying a user interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet as in Claims 1, 7, and 13 above, and Saidenberg further discloses:

a. the portal application server generates HTML having user interface components and associates the generated HTML with the style sheet, the system

further comprising: a browser for displaying the user interface components according to the style sheet (page 4, paragraph 35/page 12, paragraph 100).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed February 1, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 1, 7, and 13: Applicant argues, "The Examiner has not factually established that the software instructions in Saidenberg also call a script to retrieve user interface properties." It is respectfully submitted that Saidenberg discloses the limitation as claimed above. Saidenberg discloses software instructions, which broadly interpreted may be a browser for instance. The software instructions in Saidenberg include a javascript file which identifies which stylesheet to load in the application. The Kay reference is relied upon to teach the limitation of when the software instructions are disposed in a Java applet. Kay is similar in the sense that it is a system which uses a Java Applet to call a stylesheet in a browser. In response to applicant's argument that the Examiner's asserted benefit for the combination is factually unsupported, the applicant is directed to the motivation provided by Kay, "the transformation will run on the client machine, which saves resources on the server," and the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OMAR ABDUL-ALI whose telephone number is (571)270-1694. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri(Alternate Fridays Off) 8:30 - 6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OAA
6/04/2008

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2178